DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 152 UD 023 671

AUTHOR Rist, Ray C.
TITLE Language and Literacy: An Overview of Policies and Programs in Five OECD Member Countries.
INSTITUTION Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 47p.; Paper prepared in connection with the OECD/CERI Project on the "Financing, Organization and Governance of Education for Special Populations."
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; *Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Foreign Countries; Governance; Government Role; *Immigrants; Indigenous Populations; Language Planning; *Literacy Education; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS Canada; France; Spain; United Kingdom; West Germany

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the results of a study conducted by the Center for Educational Research and Innovation regarding language policies and programs in five countries which belong to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: Canada, France, Spain, the United Kingdom, and West Germany. Part I explains the study's focus on language diversity and how it is addressed within the educational systems of the countries studied. It is assumed that the role ascribed to language is a key one to a better understanding of the position of various cultural groups in a society. The study methodology and content are described. (A set of simultaneous case studies were taken, each developed according to a common frame of reference.) Part II discusses the distinctions drawn between each country for the purpose of analysis: historical and ecological considerations; geographical boundedness versus dispersal; time the special population has been within the national boundaries; government policy on culture and language; the permanence/impermanence of the language/cultural minority group; and governmental policymaking (centralized versus decentralized). In Part III, the data from all five countries are analyzed collectively in relation to three themes--organization, finance, and governance. A postscript reiterates that language and literacy policies accurately reflect social and political conditions. A concluding section recommends areas for further study. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUL 5 - 1984

ED246152

LANGUAGE AND LITERACY: AN OVERVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN FIVE OECD MEMBER COUNTRIES.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ray C. Rist
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

This paper has been prepared in connection with the OECD/CERI Project on the "Financing, Organization and Governance of Education for Special Populations".

Ray C. Rist, Ph.D.
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

December 1979

UD023671

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

INTRODUCTION..... 1

Study Methodology..... 3

Study Content..... 4

PART II

Historical and Ecological Considerations..... 7

Geographical Boundedness Versus Dispersal..... 9

Time the Special Population Has Been within the National Boundaries..... 10

Government Policy on Culture and Language..... 12

The Permanence/Impermanence of the Language/Cultural Minority Group..... 14

Governmental Policy Making: Centralized versus Decentralized..... 16

PART III

Organization..... 18

Finance..... 23

Governance..... 31

Postscript..... 36

REFERENCES..... 39

LANGUAGE AND LITERACY: AN OVERVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN FIVE OECD MEMBER COUNTRIES.

I.

INTRODUCTION

Consider this description of contemporary Europe:

> Today Europe is a conglomerate of twenty-four states, two of them--Turkey and the Soviet Union--extending into Asia, and another five--Andorra, Lichtenstein, Malta, San Marino, and the Vatican--comprising fewer than 350 square miles each. Nearly thirty languages are spoken in these countries: English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Flemish, Dutch, Gaelic, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, Russian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Romanian, Slovene, Croatian, Serbian, Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, and Turkish. That list can be extended if we include regional and minority languages such as Catalan in Spain; Basque in Spain and France; Welsh in Great Britain, Romansh in Switzerland; Wendish and Sorbian in the German Democratic Republic; Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, White Russian and Ukrainian in the Soviet Union. It is no exaggeration to describe this extreme variety as a linguistic tapestry, a mosaic of languages. (Ross, 1979: 151-52)

Though this diversity is surely considerable, it is not unique to Europe. When one examines, for example, the variety of languages in North America, on the African continent, and on the Asian sub-continent, it is immediately apparent that it is not simply Europe that is a

linguistic mosaic, but indeed such is how one might now characterize different regions throughout the world.

It is within the context of such complexity and enormity that the Center for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) of the OECD has chosen to undertake the present project, though wisely and with caution. For there are few issues as those surrounding language--its political, cultural, social and economic implications--that can stir controversy, create friction, and lead to conflict. Indeed, it is to the credit of the CERI group that they have not shied away from this sensitive matter, but have sought to explicate some aspects of it so as to increase our understanding of the role of language in the affairs of nations.

Of particular concern in this present effort is the manner in which language diversity is addressed within the educational systems of five member countries. As has been stated by CERI:

> This study proposes to examine the major policy instruments--financing, organization, and governance--underlying language and literacy programmes for young people of diverse linguistic or cultural backgrounds in five OECD Member Countries: Canada, France, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany. It is assumed that the role ascribed to language is a key one to a better understanding of the position of various cultural groups in a society. Ultimately, although beyond the scope of the study itself, is the question of the fate of cultural identities as expressed by language and literacy in multicultural societies. (CERI/OECD, 1978: 1)

By studying the programs and policies in these five member countries, the CERI has sought to develop a basis from which to better understand the rationale and implementation of educational programs within multicultural societies. In each of the countries selected for study, language and literacy programs serve specific social and educational

goals. Analyzing these goals can begin to inform our understandings of the means by which a multicultural reality is inferred, defined, and responded to within the national context. How each country defines its situation establishes constraints upon the available responses, at least so far as one can assume that policy formation and program implementation are the consequences of articulated responses to existing social realities.

Study Methodology

Succinctly, the approach taken within this effort has been that of a set of simultaneous case studies, each developed according to a common frame of reference. That this is a common form of analysis and one widely used (cf. Schermerhorn, 1970 for an elaboration of both the theoretical and methodological framework) should not detract from the continuing challenge of melding a coherent understanding of the range of available responses. Systemic differences are a constant problem in any cross-national exercise. For the CERI study, a five part frame of reference was developed. The sections, listed consecutively, were: Introduction, Historical Background, Language and literacy policy for education in a multicultural society, Overview of the provisions, and Conclusions and areas for international comparison.

As might be anticipated when an effort is undertaken that spans two continents and five nations, not all six reports (there were two from Canada) covered each of the five sub-divisions of the common outline. The following table displays the areas covered by each report.

This table should be taken as an approximation. The benefit of the doubt has been given in all instances. Still, the trend was clear: the papers were consistently strong on the analysis of the historical and cultural background to the current situation in the

Table 1

Content Coverage by Area of the Five National Studies

	Intro-duction	Historical Background	Language & Literacy Policy	Overview of Pro-visions	Conclusions and Comparisons
Canada					
(Prujiner)	x	x	x		
(Churchill)	x	x	x	x	
France	x	x	x	x	
Spain	x	x	x		
United Kingdom	x	x	x	x	x
Germany, Federal Republic	x	x	x	x	

respective countries and likewise with the discussion of the general policies in the countries. Detailing the provisions resulting from governmental policy, particularly at the state or provincial and local levels, was omitted in several instances. All but one paper chose not to address the implications of language and literacy policy with respect to specific groups in the society in terms of the kind of balance being achieved amidst diverse cultural aspirations. Likewise, little was provided on the ability of education to achieve stated policy goals as compared with the efforts of other sectors or agencies to effect an acceptable multicultural society.

Study Content

The goal of the CERI effort has been the elucidation of the "ways and means" that particular language or literacy programs have been

defined and then operationalized in the respective five countries. As such, there has been an effort to analyze both the philosophical or epistemological dimension as well as the more pragmatic concern with the questions of organization, financing, and governance of the programs in question. In regard to the former, that of the contextual understanding of the policy/program, all country reports were asked to describe 1) the conceptions of cultural and linguistic diversity within the national context; 2) how planning for language and literacy thus occurred; and 3) the relevance of political and historical conditions as influences upon present (or proposed) language and literacy policies/programs for specific populations. That this has been done successfully by the various authors will be evident in the following section where a number of typologies emanating from this work will be presented.

With this political and historical context in place, the CERI objective was to turn to the specifics of differing national provisions. As was noted:

> Having identified particular cultural groups and placed them in their social context, and after elaborating the bases of language and literacy policy, signficant on-going or proposed educational provisions are selected for analysis. The objectives of language and literacy provisions will be better understood in relation to the organization, financial and governance arrangements undertaken to implement them....(CERI/OECD, 1978: 4)

Key to understanding of the organizational status of a provision was to be the analysis of the degree to which power and influence were vested in either short or long term solutions to the particular policy question. While one nation, for example, might have taken the stance that the learning of the language of the host country was to be accomplished in the shortest time possible, another might have taken a more

long range view that the mastery of a language, like assimilation in general, was a process to occur over time and that short term solutions were unlikely to succeed.

Other aspects of the organization of language and literacy policies/programs in the five countries selected for this present study centered on 1) the degree to which bi- or multi-lateral international agreements and treaties influenced the provisions of the programs and 2) which institutions were to provide what services and under whose auspices. The matter was not merely one of programmatic control but rather that of making fundamental assumptions regarding the degree to which various recipients of language and literacy programs were or were not fundamentally integrated into the host society.

These brief comments on the organizational dimension of this study are by no means meant to be exhaustive, but rather suggestive of the content areas explored within this rubric. A more detailed examination of this issue, along with those of the finance and governance issues, will be presented later in the paper.

In focusing on the <u>financing</u> of language and literacy programs for special populations, the CERI noted:

> A study of the financing--both in terms of the volume of funds and the way in which it is generated and disbursed--of language and literacy programmes is a way of assessing the importance attached to such provisions and of tracing their relationships to other areas of educational provision. For example, it will be useful to determine whether there are additional funds through special sources, who in fact pays for and receives any "targeted" resources that might be made available; and what linkages there might be between measures taken by local authorities and central government initiatives such as matched-funding or "pump priming". (1978: 5)

And likewise, with respect to the examination of the governance issues, the CERI stated:

> An examination of matters of governance would illuminate the type of control exercised both formally and informally by the educational establishment and the concerned groups themselves. Thus, discussion of governance will be taken in the broadest sense in order to examine the type and nature of control exercised on the learning process and its content. (1978: 6)

By means of these three foci, the date generated from these case studies should be informative in illuminating a key aspect of any policy analysis--the relation of intended to actual program outcomes. The aggregation of finding from a research design that allows for variations in cultural context, in national approaches to language and literacy policy, and in the financing and governance of existing or proposed programs provides a wealth of information from which to examine intended effects and actual results. It is in this manner that the CERI has sought to capitalize on the individual case studies so as to enhance our understanding of language and literacy policies/programs for special populations.

II.

Historical and Ecological Considerations

To define and then examine the range of policy/program alternatives present in the five countries necessitates establishing conceptual boundaries. Indeed, one of the most serious problems that constantly challenges policy makers is that of containing the definition of the issue at hand. The broader the definition, the larger the net within which to collect extraneous and non-relevant information. Alternatively, defining the issue too narrowly means that one takes the risk of

excluding material that ought to be considered. Policy analysis, and cross-national policy analysis in particular, constantly has to deal with the tension between the scope and specificity of the analytic framework.

For this present effort, a series of criteria will be presented which should be useful in examining the policy/program variations and alternatives present among the five nations. The goal is to create an analytic framework from which to analyze the variety of means by which countries have confronted their own multiculturalism and its implications for education. The case studies suggest that given different historical contexts, the policy/program responses are likely to vary. The limits on one's policy options also create limits on one's programmatic responses.[1] Yet these five countries are not so dissimilar in all ways as to leave no basis for cross-national analysis. The country reports, taken together, suggest that patterns do exist. The task is to formulate a framework from within which to examine them.

A caveat here is necessary. No report from any country sought to examine the situation of <u>all</u> cultural and language minority groups in that country. The result was selective attention to particular groups. This has meant that generalizations on the national scene are extremely tenuous. To exclude, for example, an examination of the Basque situation in Spain or the Breton situation in France from this present analysis means that the picture is incomplete for those two countries. The same can be said for the remaining three countries as

---

[1] In reading the various reports, it has become clear that many of the choices were made decades ago. They have become so deeply embedded in each nation's constitutional and institutional structure that they are now extremely difficult to isolate and treat as available levers of change. These historical choices have had many unforeseen effects on the alternatives open to the countries as they have responded to the language and literacy needs of special populations within their respective borders.

well. In each, the task established by the OECD was to do an in-depth study of a specific group or cluster of groups as opposed to a comprehensive national survey.

To inform the reader of the populations which serve as the basis for this present analysis, the following list indicates the special populations targeted in each of the five nations:

CANADA	English speaking minority in Quebec; and the French speaking minority in New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba.
FRANCE	Recently arrived minorities, especially those from Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, French-speaking Africa, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Yugoslavia, Turkey and Poland.
GERMANY	Recently arrived minorities; especially those from Turkey, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Spain.
SPAIN	The indigenous Catalan speaking population in Catalogna.
UNITED KINGDOM	The Welsh speaking indigenous population plus recently arrived minorities, especially those from the British Commonwealth countries in Africa and Asia.

1) Geographical Boundedness Versus Dispersal

Perhaps the most readily apparent basis by which to distinguish among the five nations is that of the geographical boundedness versus dispersal of the cultural and language minority groups within their national boundaries. Whereas the United Kingdom, Spain, and Canada have clearly defined geographical parameters which delineate the presence of

language minorities, i.e., the Province of Quebec in Canada, that of the national region or "Communidades Autonomas" of Catalogna in Spain, and that of Wales in the United Kingdom. The same cannot be said of the Federal Republic of Germany or France. Of course with these latter two countries, there are exceptions. But a characterization of their "dispersion" among the language minorities listed earlier is more accurate than it would be to identify the minorities in these countries as geographically isolated or concentrated.

The notion of geographical definitiveness is one that has interested researchers on race relations for some decades. Francis (1976) devotes considerable attention to the role that this condition has upon majority-minority relations. Likewise, the recent work of Rex (1970) and Allen (1971) contribute to our understandings in this area, particularly to that of the origins of the subjective and stereotypic views the dominant group holds about one or more minority groups. The evidence of such separateness on social stratification as well as social perceptions suggests that it is a particularly powerful force in the structuring of inter-group relations. The country reports have explicated a number of ways in which language policy has been central to this organizing of the various social systems, not the least of which have been language segregated schools, government prohibition on the use of particular languages, and the refusal of government and business to use any but the dominant language in their activities.

2) Time the Special Population Has Been within the National Boundaries

Historical longevity of the language minority within the current national boundaries appears to be a salient distinction among the five

countries. Indeed, those with the longest history are also those who are most geographically concentrated. In
Catalonian region in Spain, and the Welsh region of Great Britain, the groups of interest in this present analysis have a history dating back several centuries or more.

In contrast, the immigration of language and cultural minorities to France and Germany is relatively recent, and their residency in these two countries can be measured literally in terms of months and years. The major migrations of language immigrants into these host countries has occurred within the past three decades (cf. Rist, 1978a). Though it is not an issue stressed in the country reports, it can be added that the social and demographic characteristics of the latter language minority groups do not approximate those of the former. The migrations into Western Europe in the 1960's and 1970's were migrations of manpower, not of entire populations. These recent immigrants have been overwhelming young, actively involved in the labor force, and frequently alone. This is in contrast to the situations in the historical communities of Canada, Wales, and Spain where there is an inter-generational continuity and both formal and informal social systems that sustain the mother tongue. While informal social systems are now emerging in France and Germany, they are neither so elaborate nor roots as in the historical communities.

As is evident in the country reports, the discussion of policy/program alternatives suggests that the combined factors of dispersal plus recent arrival have influenced governmental efforts in directions quite different from those of the governments addressing issues

related to the geographically distinct and long term populations.

3) Governmental Policy on Culture and Language

In an earlier draft of this paper, governmental policies on culture and language were treated as distinct entities. Several detailed discussions with colleages have convinced me that it is important to examine them simultaneously,as they are inextricably interwoven. Thus what follows is an effort to elaborate on the interrelations as well as variations in cultural and language policies for the five nations.

In assessing government policy, what is immediately striking about these five nations is that those three nations with 1) the historical communities and which 2) have been geographically distinct are 3) the same three nations that have most forcefully enunciated a national policy of multi-lingualism,as well as 4) the preservation of the culture of the concerned populations. In contrast, the stance of Germany and France appears to be one of stressing monolingualism in the dominant tongue as well as the assimilation of the recent arrivals into the dominant culture. This, of course, may be stating the distinctions a bit too sharply, but the variations between these two groups of countries is much greater than the variations within the respective groups. Canada, Spain, and England do share a common commitment to the preservation of the mother tongue of their respective language minorities and have instituted governmental policies to ensure that this is so. By doing so, they have also given assent to preserving the cultures within which these languages are now used.

A particularly persuasive argument was made in several of the country reports : specifically, the reason that the language minorities in the

historical communities have been able to institutionalize and legitimate the use of their own language in that they have successfully used their distinct geographic base for the formation of a political force on the national political scene. A cohesive and politically active population in these areas was successful in efforts to secure governmental sanction for a pluralistic and bi-lingual policy.

Juxtaposed is the relative powerlessness of the immigrant/minority groups in Germany and France. In different variations across these two countries, immigrant groups are restricted in their political participation, their ability to unionize, their ability to seek employment, their ability to gain access to state supported housing, their ability to be granted "due process" in the judicial system, their ability to protect their current employment from unemployed nationals, and most central to this present analysis, their ability to influence, govern, or direct the educational systems within which their children are educated. With the language minorities being widely dispersed and coming from multiple sending countries (each with a different culture and language), the result is the formation of policy at the national level by the dominant group to encourage a monolingual and assimilationist approach toward these disparate peoples.

An issue raised here deserves further attention. An important distinction to be drawn between the historical communities and those of the recent immigrants is that in each instance, the historical community consists of a single language and cultural group geographically distinct and reinforcing the use of the mother tongue. With Germany and France, the minorities in each country come from multiple sending countries, thus creating a cultural and linguistic mosaic. The dispersal of

multiple groups across each of the two countries makes within-group cohesion difficult, let alone the consideration of between-group collaboration and cooperation. The pre-conditions for the development of a national policy affirming multilingualism appear to be nearly, if not completely, absent at present in both Germany and France.

4) The Permanence/Impermanence of the Language/Cultural Minority Group

Public policy and public perceptions within the five countries as to the permanence or impermanence of the language and cultural minorities vary greatly. On the one hand, there are those countries (Spain, Canada, and England) where it is not a question of whether the Catalonians, Quebecois, or Welsh shall remain as residents. They have citizenship and a historical claim that makes irrelevant any suggestion of them being transient.

The same cannot be said for the recent immigrants into England from Asia and Africa, or the immigrants into Germany and France from the Mediterranean basin. In both countries, there is strong sentiment among a portion of the native population that the new arrivals are not to be thought of as permanent residents. Rather, they are migrants who will eventually (either willingly or not) be going home to their respective sending countries. Indeed, across Western Europe there have been multiple initiatives and proposals for the repatriation of the recent arrivals, e.g., the "Schwartzenbach Initiatives" in Switzerland, the 1975 statement of the Premier of the state of Baden-Württemberg in Germany, and the 1978 call from the federation of French employers (Confédération Nationale due Patronat Francais) (cf. Rist, 1978b).

Another factor which contributes to the belief that the recent arrivals are not to be thought of as permanent immigrants is that actions

have been taken in all three countries to halt further in-migration of nationals from the former sending countries. The labor migration halts in 1973 in Germany and 1974 in France coupled with the recent proposals of the British government to limit immigration reinforce the beliefs of those nationals who do not consider the new arrivals as potential citizens.

One result of this view is that language and literacy programs have been developed to both promote and strengthen mother tongue instruction. This is being done, not with the assumption that mother tongue instruction is the necessary precursor to second language instruction, but that mother tongue instruction is necessary for those who will be returning to their countries of origin. One of the clearest examples of this approach is to be found in the Land of Bavaria where more than 1000 Turkish teachers have been brought to Bavaria to teach Turkish children the Turkish language and within the context of the Turkish curriculum. German in these classes is taught as a foreign language for no more than eight hours per week (cf. Rist, 1978c).

It must be noted, however, that the issues are not so clearly drawn vis-à-vis educational policy in France and England. The situation is somewhat blurred as many of the recent arrivals do speak French or English as their first tongue, but come from a different cultural background. When mother tongue classes are offered, it is more likely that they are given based on the rationale that a basic understanding of mother tongue is essential for learning a second language, i.e., French or English. This is the so-called "transitional approach" to language learning, one of four options for language education outlined

by Fishman and discussed in the paper by Rosen and Crispin (p. 60).[2]

Language and literacy instruction in the mother tongue can be offered for quite different reasons and with quite different social and political goals in mind. Which is only to say that defining the context within which to analyze language and literacy programs/policies is critical.

5) Governmental Policy Making: Centralized versus Decentralized.

If it were not enough that such wide variations exist in the social and historical context surrounding the presence of language and cultural minorities in the five nations, there is the added variation in the fact that the countries do not share a common framework for governmental policy making with regard to language and literacy. The country reports provide sufficient data to suggest that the various approaches can be placed on a continuum from highly centralized and nationally administered to highly decentralized and locally administered. When examining the variations and patterns among the five nations, the matrix becomes more and more complex. In matching policy making approaches against the four historical and ecological factors previously listed in this section, the immediate conclusion to be drawn is that, at best, and only for those populations of direct concern in the present study, one can speak of broad trends. Precise and delimited statements as to the interrelations are outside the domain of presently available data.

The continuum can be conceptualized as one that begins at a

---

[2]Yet a third option, as is the case in England, Spain, and Canada for the Welsh, Catalonian, and Quebecois populations respectively, is that mother tongue instruction can be offered as a means to strengthen the commitment and reality of being a multi-lingual society.

centralized and national pivot and moves through regional or state levels of policy making on to the pivot of local and decentralized decision making. The reports suggest that France is the most centralized and England the least; Spain might be described as a country where the policy making is shared between the national and regional or state authorities, while in Canada and Germany, the combination is more one of the state governments working with local jurisdictions to formulate overall educational policy. Again, it should be cautioned that this is but an approximation and there are several exceptions that will be discussed later in the paper.

Having suggested a number of criteria by which an examination of the five nations could provide insights on the study of language and literacy programs/policies, a central conclusion one can draw is that, indeed, historical and ecological factors are relevant. Important variations are evident: the two countries with recent and dispersed multiple immigrant populations are the same two countries where the diverse immigrant and language minorities are politically weak. These groups have not achieved any governmental legitimation of a pluralistic or preservationist approach to their own cultural and linguistic origins.

Finally, there are the political assumptions and definitions regarding the permanence of the language or cultural minority group within the country. Germany, France, and England have not defined themselves as countries of immigration, thus implying a tenuousness to the residency of recent arrivals (cf. Rist, 1979b). While Spain has been primarily a country of emigration, Canada has served as a country of immigration for both English and French speaking persons. In these varying circumstances, the responsiveness of the five governments and the willingness of the educational authorities to stress either the

intregration or separation of the linguistic and cultural minority groups is evident. The policy formulation and programmatic responses are influenced by the assumptions regarding the political legitimacy and permanance of these same groups, not the least of which is how the language groups themselves define their presence.

III.

It is within the context of these distinctions among the five nations that the following analysis of the organization, financing, and governance of language and literacy programs for young people of diverse linguistic or cultural backgrounds is to be undertaken. The data supplied by the national studies suggest not only policy and programmatic commonalities and/or differences among these western, industrialized nations, but also re-emphasize yet again the substantive and symbolic importance of language within multicultural societies.

Organization

From the writings of Archer (1979), Persell (1977), and Summerfield (1974) among others, the evidence continues to build and support the notion that the social organization of education rests upon fundamental political and ideological considerations. Thus the definitions of problems, the manner in which resources are marshalled to address these same problems, and the programmatic form such responses take are integrally related. How the issue is defined significantly influences and limits the alternatives (cf. Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973).

An examination of the organizational framework for literacy and language programs created to assist young people of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds firmly supports this line of analysis.

First and perhaps most revealing is the finding that language and literacy programs throughout the five nations tend to be decentralized in their administration at the national level. Indeed, not one of the five nations has established a separate ministry, or even more plausible, a single department responsible for the coordination and implementation of language and literacy programs for immigrant and cultural minority youth. What is evident is that the various national administrative hierarchies for education have not seen this issue as so distinctive and separate from other aspects of educational policy and programs that they need organize sizeable aspects of their bureaucracies to respond.

What are in evidence are multiple sub-ministry departments each with partial responsibility for language and literacy programs. This organizational form, in particular, characterizes Canada, France, and Spain. Spain and France are both centralized in their decision-making and reflect this in their administrative hierarchy. The national governments within these two nations play a decisive role in the formulation and implementation of educational policy. Canada, alternatively, has a more decentralized administrative system with each of the provinces assuming many of the key administrative responsibilities granted national officials in Spain and France. That Canada is decentralized is evident in the Churchill paper when one examines how each of the three predominantly English-speaking provinces have organized their language services for the French-speaking minority. No two of these three provinces have created the same organizational form. That Canada has such an administrative hierarchy suggests an approach of national goals being implemented through provincial policy.

Data on Germany and England indicate that both have an extremely diffuse organizational structure for the administration of language and literacy programs. There is no visible responsibility in this area within Germany, and it is spread across a number of sectors of the English central administration. The German situation is understandable in light of the post-war diffusion of educational authority to the eleven Länder. The federal role within Germany is weak in all areas of education. Within England, the diffusion of responsibility to local educational authorities thus limits the authority the central administration is able to exercise.

What is of some import in the British and German situations is the fact that these are the two countries that have been most ambivalent about the presence of recently arrived language and cultural minorities within their national boundaries. Second generation persons born in England of non-Anglo backgrounds are yet commonly referred to as immigrants, denoting their "newness", their assumed lack of permanence, their lack of historical ties, and their fundamental lack of an "English identity". Recent articles by Kirp (1979) and Killian (1979) and the book by Freeman (1979) have all explored this phenomena in some detail. Killian writes (1979:187):

> Many white Britishers are aware of the use of the term "immigrant" as a euphemism and many minority members violently protest it, but it is nevertheless widely used to mean "nonwhite" or "colored". The British race problem, unlike that in the United States, is dealt with as an immigrant problem, although the flow of newcomers from the West Indies, Asia and Africa (particularly Uganda) was heaviest from 1948 until 1961 and despite the fact that a whole second generation now entering adulthood was born in England... For a number of years, the Department of Education and Science officially defined an "immigrant child" as one who was born abroad or whose parents had lived in the United Kingdom for not more than ten years.

The ambivalence in Germany and England towards immigrant and cultural minorities is reflected in a myriad number of programs on the regional and local levels. In Germany, the various Länder have developed quite different programs, several in fundamental opposition to each other, e.g., Berlin and Bavaria. While Berlin treats the Gastarbeiter as new immigrants into the country and as persons to be assisted in their integration into the mainstream of German society, the Bavarian approach is one predicated upon the eventual return of the Gastarbeiter to their home countries. Bavaria presumes the rotation of the foreign workers out of Germany while Berlin presumes their performance within Germany (cf. Rist, 1979c).

In those countries where the future status of the language and cultural minorities is least clearly defined at the national level, one also finds that educational policy is inconsistent and not uniformly adopted vis-à-vis language and literacy programs. The educational programs, furthermore, do not necessarily assist in clarifying the situation. They may, in fact, actively contribute to the confusion. Indeed, here is but another instance of political realities superceding and defining educational realities. Choosing not to define one's national culture as multicultural influences educational policy and practice as much as a choice to do so.

A second finding from this survey is that there exists, almost without exception, a confusing array of overlapping jurisdictions involving the national government, the provincial governments (especially Canada, Spain, and Germany), and the local educational authorities. These overlaps influence not only the administration and organization of language and literacy programs for immigrant and cultural minorities, but the financing of these programs as well. The maze of administrative

regulations, the variations in inter-governmental policies and the location of program decision-making in countless agencies, boards, committees, sub-committees, ministries, departments, and coordination ccuncils thwarts any coherent comparative analysis along this dimension.

Of special interest is that this overlapping and confusing set of jurisdictions appears just as readily in those countries with indigenous language minorities (Spain and Canada) as it does the countries where linguistically and culturally different groups are recent arrivals. (The United Kingdom fits both sides of this proposition, depending upon the group in question.) The longevity of a language or cultural minority within a country does not necessarily imply that the relations between that group and the remaining portions of the society are either stable or well articulated. The opposite appears to be more nearly the case at present in both Canada and Spain.

Confusion in administration and organization perhaps reflects confusion over goals. Each of the five nations are in a state of flux regarding their language and literacy policies. Whether the various nations be characterized as opting for centralized decision making or decentralized decision making; whether they have concentrated or dispersed language and cultural minority groups; and whether these same groups are of recent or long term presence, variation and uncertainty characterize current policies in the respective countries.

Central to this confusion is the major political issue of the degree to which minority language education can be considered a "right" as opposed to a "privilege" and the extent to which the exercise of such a right should be the responsibility of the varying jurisdictional levels of education, i.e., national, provincial, or local.

In Canada, Wales and Spain, the language minorities appear closest to having instruction in their own language considered a right; for the remaining groups of concern in this analysis, it is considered a privilege. Neither Germany, France, nor England considers it a formal constitutional responsibility to offer mother tongue instruction to recent arrivals. They choose to do it for pedagogical reasons, for reasons of bi-national agreements, or to comply with the European Economic Community agreement of 1977. (This agreement binds the participatory nations, "within the context of their national situation", to provide mother tongue instruction to children of immigrant workers.) Only in those countries which have adopted policies legitimating the creation of a multicultural national identity has instruction in mother tongue been considered a protected right.

Finance

The financing of language and literacy programs for special populations of youth involves two interrelated and reciprocal processes: taxation and distribution. While taxation has, for the western democracies, been an activity that has cut across all levels of government, distribution has always been under more heavy national influence. This is because the growth of the welfare state was initially a national enterprise. Transfers which could be easily standardized, e.g., old-age pensions, unemployment benefits, and health care payments, have been almost universally handled at the national level. They quite easily can be made without the assistance of the local governments. These are personal transfers and make up a large percentage of the total transfer payments in all the modern democracies (Ashford, 1979).

This is not to say that as the welfare state expands, there is not more activity at the local level; there is. But the situation is one of the national governments making the decisions on how resources are to be allocated and how benefits are to be delivered. The increased size of the welfare state has, almost without exception, resulted in greater national restrictions on local decisions. As the western societies increasingly expand their definitions on the role and responsibility of the state towards its citizens, the responsibility for the financial burden is almost always carried by the national government. The corollary to this is that the role of the national government in taxation has also been commensurately increased.

But when one turns to an area like education, where the direct transfer approach is less appropriate, the alternative is reliance on indirect transfers. Funds are supplied to institutions to supply goods and services to specific groups of clients.

The country reports suggest that the national governments move resources to lower levels within the educational system through a host of programs, agencies, and types of formula funding. The reports also suggest that local governmental agencies vary widely in their access to these channels of funding. Each country appears to have developed a different pattern of access. For example, interactions between the national and state/local levels of government in France is clearly concentrated around patterns of transfer between the national government and the local educational agency; in England and Wales, as well as Spain, it is much the same; in Germany the relation is one between the individual states and the local authorities. Only in Canada are all three levels of government--national, provincial, and local--involved in both the taxation and subsequent distribution of resources.

As might be expected, the result is that the politics of educational finance differs greatly from the economics of educational finance. Relatively small sums of money come to take on immense political importance and large blocks of funds may well elude political influence. (The paper on England and Wales in particular lends considerable weight to this last contention.)

An oft-cited truism suggests, "He who pays the piper calls the tune". Stated alternatively, financial resources can be used as a means of power and control. Data from this present study suggest that while such may be true in particular instances, it is by no means a universal set of relations. An examination of the financial resources and the control of their allocation for language and literacy programs provides an interesting window from which to study such provisions as do exist for language and cultural minority youth.

Integral to the examination of power and control are the matters of form and source of funding for language and literacy programs. Table 2 suggests the form and source of funding across the five nations.

While at first glance this table suggests no discernible patterns, closer examination provides several insights. First, Spain and England have a quite comparable set of arrangements whereby the source of support for language and literacy programs comes from the national government and comes in the form of block grants or formula assistance to local educational authorities. But what makes this situation of particular interest is that the two countries which have centralized funding vary considerably in the level of central planning and policy coordination that occurs vis-à-vis language and literacy programs.

England is quite decentralized. As Rosen and Crispin (p. 96) have noted:

> Frankly, in the British system, control is usually too strong a word: influence and persuasion are more apposite. However, if there is any control regarding language and

Table 2

The Form and Source of Funding for Language and Literacy Programs

	Form		Source		
	Categorical Grant for Language Instruction	General Formula Assistance	Federal	Provincial	Local
CANADA					
Quebec	x		x	x	x
Manitoba	x		x	x	x
New Brunswick		x	x	x	
Ontario	x		x	x	x
SPAIN		x	x		
FRANCE	x		x		
ENGLAND		x	x		x
GERMANY					
Berlin	x			x	
Bavaria	x			x	
Nordrhine-Westfalen	x			x	

> literacy provision, then, in practice, it is vested in the local authorities...and in their existing educational infrastructure.

Spain is clearly centralized in its planning (though a proposed set of revisions in regard to decentralizing educational decision-making has been made).

A second implication of the table is that inter-governmental collaboration is selective. Of concern is how this pattern of selectivity bodes for future funding through established budget channels. One can observe only in Canada, for example, the instance of all three levels of government--national, provincial, and local--involved in the funding of language and literacy programs. Of the remaining four nations, England alone involves local support for language and literacy programs. In France and Spain, the funding is exclusively national while in Germany, the funds come from the individual Länder. What lends a particular urgency to this issue is that however imperfectly or reluctantly, all levels of government must learn to live with reduced growth, if not outright steady state. The fact that many of the basic functions of education must continue, regardless of local choice, means that those functions which are financed by discretionary resources are more vulnerable. As the number of instances multiply when educational authorities will have to choose between the continuation of basic programs and those designed for special populations, the likely direction of those decisions is already clear. To maintain special programs may depend upon the readiness of individual localities to tax themselves at increased rates.

England is between these two poles, drawing upon financial support from both the national and local levels. The authors of the paper on England and Wales also note that such collaboration should suggest optimism regarding future expenditure programs for language and literacy efforts, (cf. p. 107). England is also something of an

anomaly in this context, as it is the one country of the five where language minorities are few in absolute numbers. Recent (and not so recent) arrivals are, more likely than not, English speaking. Thus there has occurred a slight and often subtle shift in the goal of the programs--away from that of language and literacy to the broader matter of cultural awareness. Local, community-based efforts provide the framework within which varying ethnic and cultural groups are recognized and responded to by English policymakers.

The third implication, and a corollary to the second, is that the fate of language and literacy programs is integrally linked to decisions made at the national level. Only Germany does not involve the national level in the support of these programs. On the one hand, proponents of language and literacy programs for immigrant and cultural minorities can applaud this situation as it suggests that the discriminations of hostilities often found in local communities cannot, of themselves, eliminate the programs. Parallel to the argument made in the United States during the time of the Civil Rights movement that "locals could not be trusted" to uphold and support civil rights programs, the argument can be made that what educational services that do exist for the minorities are there because they are supported at the national level.

Alternatively, one can argue that the central role played by the national government in all but one of the countries also makes the long-term existence of these programs somewhat precarious. The political decisions on how resources are allocated at the national level are often influenced by the various vested interest groups involved and the support they direct towards propositions favoring their own objectives.

The fact that the language and cultural minorities are frequently unorganized politically (indeed, they have little or no political voice in Germany or France) suggests that the resources now allocated for language and literacy programs are vulnerable to being allocated elsewhere. This is particularly so if the funds are categorical. When the category is eliminated, so are the programs.

It is important in an analysis of the allocation of resources to separate out the source of funds from the matter of control over the funds. Previously, it has been noted that in the English context, overt control and power by the national government was not evident and perhaps even shunned. Authority had been granted to the local educational administrators. It was they who defined the programmatic response to the language and literacy needs of special populations.

In Germany, the situation is different. Federal control is extremely weak, as is local control. The decision-making power rests at the provincial level. Thus the policies and programs that are in place in the various Länder reflect more accurately regional as opposed to federal or local views. It is within this regional context that one can assess the political and ideological views of those in power regarding the place of the Gasterbeiter and their families in German (read regional) society. The discussion in the German Country Report on the approach of the three Länder towards both mother tongue instruction and bilingual instruction is particularly informative in this regard (cf. pp. 39-44).

The Spanish situation is one in flux. While, heretofore, the funding and control has been quite centralized, there are at present

efforts underway to decentralize the authority over language and literacy programs to various regional governments. Funding, however, would remain within the federal domain. There appears to be no pressure to modify the current general formula assistance that local school districts receive from the national treasury.

The Canadian situation is unlike that of the other four nations. Canada has involved all three levels of government in the funding of language and literacy programs. All three also appear to have some if not equal input into the policy process as to the form and content of the funded efforts. If there is a weak member in this triad, it appears to be the national government.

In France, the source of funding for language and literacy programs is the national level. It is in this same arena where the control of the policy process resides. But as the CERI analysis of the French situation suggests, it is this centralization of the decision-making process that stands in constant tension with the pluralism and growing tendency towards diversity evident within French society (cf. Lamage, p. 71). The government favors a hierarchical and unified policy approach to all matters affecting education. Yet this implies that there are necessarily situations where national policies are not particularly appropriate nor well received at the local level. The result is that these initiatives are not always well or enthusiastically implemented. Yet few public resources or institutional channels exist at the local level to provide alternatives. This disparity, in part, accounts for the large private sector involvement throughout France in matters related to language and cultural minorities.

In sum, the distribution and allocation of public resources in each of the five countries tends to rather closely reflect the political realities of how language and cultural minorities are perceived. When efforts are made to institutionalize a national commitment to bilingualism, the financial resources and programs they support tend also to reflect this commitment. Likewise, when the host societies are ambivalent over bilingualism, there is evidence of a lack of institutionalization of the funding. Indeed, in none of the five countries does one find a mis-match between the political or ideological views towards immigrant groups and/or cultural minorities and the financing of language and literacy programs. If the policy process is one of "rationalizing" the allocation of goods and services, then the present instances suggest the effort has been successful.

Governance

To describe the current situation with regard to the governance of language and literacy programs within the five nations is to say that the issue is one that has stirred passions and generated no small amount of controversy. The substance of the debate appears to have two tightly interwoven aspects: who shall govern and how shall responsibility be divided. With respect to the question of who shall exercise governance over language and literacy policy, the data suggest that it is not merely a matter of pin-pointing which administrators within which bureaucracies. It is also necessary to be cognizant of the current political forces at work changing the very form of governance.

Both in Quebec, Canada, and in the Catalan region of Spain, governance is at root of the current efforts to realign the relations

of these regions to the remaining parts of their respective countries. What one confronts directly in both instances are the political choices between national affiliation and regional "self determination". In both situations, the language minorities have clearly defined geographical boundaries, have a history which pre-dates the emergence of the modern nation-state, and have amassed sufficient political power to be able to translate many of their aspirations into policy.

The Canadian situation is slightly more evolved than in Spain. In Canada, the emergence of a national policy of bilingualism has been in response to the recognition of the sizeable French-speaking population in the country as well as the political force they represent. Not to have opted for bilingualism would have been an open invitation to the irrevocable division of the country. (That this is yet the goal of many within Quebec suggests that concerns for political and economic autonomy weigh heavier in the final analysis than do matters of language.)

In Spain, the acknowledgment of Catalan as the official language of discourse within the province of Catalogna is yet to occur. Nevertheless, the report from Spain suggests that it is but a short time before this acknowledgment is a reality. Within Spain one finds the development of a two-tier policy: At the national level, Castilian will remain the official language, but regional languages will be recognized not only as the form of daily discourse, but as the official means for the transaction of regional governmental and economic affairs.

Within both of these nations, the governance issue appears to be one of ensuring, from the point of view of the language minorities, that they govern language and literacy programs within their respective

regions.[3] Thus the recent language laws enacted within Quebec as well as the declarations by Catalan officials give evidence of their concern to institutionalize within all major social and economic sectors their respective languages.

In those remaining parts of Spain where the Catalan speaking persons are in a minority, the situation is much more closely akin to what one finds in the nations of England, France, and Germany. In these latter three countries, the recent immigrant groups speaking other than the dominant language are in a distinct minority and there appears to be little enthusiasm for allowing the language minorities to obtain separate control of the educational process for their children.[4] Arguments in favor of this local control by minority language groups appear to be largely dismissed for two reasons in England, France and Germany. The first is that the creation of a separate school system would be expensive, and in a time of retrenchment within education, such an expansion would be unacceptable to the language majority group. The second reason for the rejection of separately controlled local educational agencies is that the diffusion of the various and multiple language minority groups throughout the respective countries means that in a large number of instances, there would not be the "critical mass" of either students or teachers necessary to sustain an educational program. Thus the services

---

[3] In Canada the Country Report suggests that the issue is not merely one restricted to the French-speaking region of Quebec, but that the concern is now national in scope, i.e., that French-speaking people wish for an autonomy and responsibility over French language instruction in all parts of Canada.

[4] The exception to this is in the area of religious and cultural instruction. In Germany, for example, the "national classes" that meet after school and on weekends are organized and supported by private religious and cultural groups. Further discussion of this point arises shortly in the paper.

would be sporadically available to some minority group youth and not to others. This lack of "distributive justice" would also make the policy extremely untenable.

As an option to the separate systems based on language or nationality, there is that of a fully multi-lingual and integrated school system which would protect the rights of the minority students, but insure that they were main-streamed within a unitary organization. This appears to be a realistic possibility only in the English language provinces of Canada. Matching a national commitment to bilingualism with considerable financial support for language programs appears absolutely essential for the minority language youth within majority systems to be afforded some degree of protection and legitimacy.

This latter option also does not appear feasible for recent immigrant minorities in England, Germany, or France. In none of these three countries is there evidence of a commitment to supporting full multi-lingualism as a goal for the educational system. Rather, all three appear committed to an assimilationist position (with only regional variations, e.g., Bavaria). This, in turn, necessitates the use of the dominant language as the single medium of communication within the schools. What evidence is available from the three country reports on instruction in mother tongue suggests that this is most often done in conjunction with effecting an eventual transition into the dominant language.

One response documented in the country reports is that private and religious groups have undertaken on a broad scale to provide cultural awareness and mother tongue instruction to the minority children. Much as was the situation in the United States when the

language minority groups established parochial schools to protect their language and religion, so the same responses now appear in Western Europe and in the English speaking regions of Canada. Indeed, the data are quite persuasive in documenting the efforts of the various language and cultural minority groups to undertake such projects on their own behalf. Establishing these organizations in the private sector becomes one means by which to compensate for the lack of policy-making authority in the public sector.

Juxtaposed to the question of who governs is the matter of the scale at which decisions are to be made. In Spain and Canada, the move is towards decentralization, shifting the policy process with respect to language and literacy from the national to the provincial level. No evidence of this appears in the description of France, while England and Germany already exist with decentralized policy-making authority. The English system is the most decentralized with the local educational authorities exercising more responsibility than in any of the four remaining countries. The German system has institutionalized the authority at the provincial level and there is no indication that this is changing.

In sum, an examination of the governance issue suggests the following: 1) Political and ideological considerations are uppermost in many of the decisions regarding language and literacy policy. The fact that when new Italian or Turkish immigrants arrive in Quebec, they have no choice but to send their children to French speaking schools, or to "transition classes" were they in Berlin or London suggests something of the manner in which control is exercised and to what ends. 2) There is an interesting hiatus between the concerns

with controlling language and literacy policy and the monitoring of how effective or efficient are the subsequent policies. Here may be but another instance of the symbolic overtaking the substantive. None of the five countries appear particularly well informed on whether their linguistic and literacy policies either match the pedagogical needs of the youth or impact in the desired manner upon the target groups. 3) The matter of governance creates a continuing dilemma for language minority groups in terms of self-determination and autonomy versus their institutional mainstreaming. Countless arguments can be offered on both sides of this issue. Yet "real life" decisions have to be made. The choice of moving in one direction tends to preclude the options available within the other. Finally, 4) governance is predicted upon power and influence, commodities which are never static. Consequently, one can anticipate that the actors, the goals, and the means used to achieve them are all constantly changing. Language and literacy policies are not likely to escape--nor should they--the transitions underway amidst these five countries.

POSTSCRIPT

There is one commonality across the five nations that deserves special mention. All share a cultural and linguistic diversity that is really quite extraordinary. There is an enormous complexity to the linguistic "infrastructure" of these nations, a complexity that has been understood in only the most superficial of ways. It still awaits a full description. And this complexity appears not to have influenced language and literacy policy in any demonstrable fashion. The nuances in the linguistic groups, the multiplicity of dialects within each

group, and the effects of interaction with the dominant language in the society all appear to be bypassed within the policy process. Less critically, one might suggest that the policy process has worked precisely by avoiding such distinctions. Allowing the groups themselves to sort out and decide on whether and how to allow private and religious classes to support mother tongue and cultural awareness classes provides both autonomy and diminished government influence. Such a mechanism may be the best means by which to allow each linguistic or cultural group to internally differentiate itself into various clusters and thus achieve greater attention to its specific language needs.

There is yet another issue which cuts across all five nations and cannot go unmentioned. Throughout this paper, words such as "racism", "prejudice", and "discrimination" have been studiously avoided. What has been presented has been an analysis of language and literacy policy in each of the countries as if those countries were "color blind". To suggest in general terms that the policy process is one which emanates from and functions within the political workings of any particular society obscures as much as it illuminates. It is something quite different to suggest that policy is not necessarily rational nor linear, but that deep-seated prejudices and racial antagonisms also must be accounted for. That such conditions exist in each of the five countries is beyond doubt. What remains to be done is to trace out the impact of these belief systems upon the opportunities/constraints experienced by the language and cultural minorities.

Last, and in light of the comments made in the discussion on governance, it should be reiterated that language and literacy policies accurately reflect social and political conditions in each of the societies.

As the status, permanence, and political influence of the various language and cultural groups change, so also will the policies affecting these groups. But the linguistic and cultural minorities are not merely passive recipients of decisions made elsewhere. They, too, are involved in creating the future for themselves and their children. As such, the interactions between these groups and others will determine the shape of future policies--policies which will not only influence the cultural identities of millions of persons, but impact upon fundamental characteristics of the societies themselves.

ON FUTURE STUDY

Heretofore, the focus of this paper has been primarily descriptive and analytic; it has not been proscriptive. This present section seeks to redress this omission by means of outlining in some detail what the "next steps" might be in further development and elaboration of the issues raised by this OECD five nation study. In specifying areas for further investigation, an effort is made in each instance to build upon what has been learned through the present endeavor. It should also be noted that the focus of concern is with policy issues. The task now is one of translating into policy concerns the findings generated by the work done to date.

A first area that bears scrutiny is that of the form and content of policy with respect to those groups that are the sole possessors of a cultural/linguistic tradition. This is in contrast to policy responses to those groups that are but one of many possessors of such a tradition. The case study from the United Kingdom prompts this analytic distinction. The situation of the Welsh, who are the sole possessors of the Welsh language and culture, is not equal to that of those who have come to the U.K., for example, from the Indian sub-continent. Succinctly, if the Welsh lose in any degree their mastery of the Welsh language and understanding of Welsh culture, that represents an absolute loss of the amount of Welsh culture/language now present. It is, as it were, a diminution of the "critical mass" of those who possess Welsh attributes. This is in contrast to those who would come to the U.K. from India or Pakistan. If these groups lose aspects of their original culture, the loss or demise of that culture is less threatened, if at all.

The policy questions to be investigated in this area are complex. When, for example, can a group make a claim to be the sole possessor of a cultural/linguistic tradition. Furthermore, if such can be determined, where ought the decision-making responsibility lie for ensuring the preservation of that tradition. Ought it be centrally administered or decentralized among those so defined as possessing the tradition. Related to the management questions are those of financing. From where ought support come to sustain the various cultural traditions. And perhaps more fundamental, through what process is agreement reached on which cultural traditions are to be supported and which are not. In short, how are political decisions made about what constitutes a viable "culture" worthy of preservation and nurture.

Related to this area is that of the role for the state in supporting cultural pluralism. Is it appropriate for the state as a political entity to support diversity, or is it more appropriate for the state to support efforts at unanimity of cultural expression. Such questions lead in turn to a concern with stability and cohesion of the modern nation-to-state. Does such come from "unity through diversity" or from "unity through sameness"? The manner in which such a question is answered can have a profound impact upon the policy decisions made regarding support for language and cultural minorities.

In many OECD nations, this latter question appears to have been answered in the affirmative through the support of diversity, e.g., language policy in both Canada and the United Kingdom. With the initial assessment of these policies now available through the present study, further effort is needed to learn more of the specifics of these provisions,

of their means of financing, of strategies for administration, and of their impact upon program development and implementation. The pivots of "government directed" versus "group directed" are critical to our understanding of the means and mechanisms by which public resources are allocated.

A second key policy area, and one that has come to the forefront throughout the industrial nations of the Western world, is that of the response towards those groups defined as impermanent. This issue is particularly relevant to the nearly 15 million guestworkers and dependents in Western Europe and the approximately 6 to 14 million undocumented workers now in the United States. The fundamental question is one of whether policy with respect to these large groups be predicated upon the presumption of the "rotation" of these same groups in and then out of the respective host countries, or upon the presumption that these same groups will remain and essentially take on the characteristics of immigrants.

In policy terms, the matter appears to hinge on the decision as to whether to attempt to organize educational provisions for the young so as to maintain their options to return to the sending country with the necessary literacy and cultural skills to compete in that country, or to press for the integration of these same youth into the host society, thus defining them as new immigrants. The organization, governance, and financing of either of these approaches suggests complexities that are only now beginning to be addressed. Further, the response is not merely one of hypothetical alternatives. The reality of literally hundreds of thousands of "second generation youth" in the host countries is not to be denied.

What is unknown at present is whether it is possible for the host society to simultaneously maintain a two-track educational system for these youth--the one track allowing for and fostering appreciation of the mother country language and culture while the other track equipping the youth to enter the economic and cultural activities of the host society. That this issue has not been resolved and that no models for accomplishing such dual socialization on a large scale level now exists suggests important areas for investigation in the coming years.

A third area of policy study concerns when it is that the size influence of a culturally different group is sufficient to warrant public intervention and support. The present five nation study suggests quite different criteria are applied across member countries. In several instances, the numerical considerations appear paramount. If a group reaches a particular figure, it is recognized and the government then makes resources available for the preservation of that same group. In other instances, size appears secondary at best as it is the political influence of a group that largely determines the policy response. The interesting generic policy question that arises from such variation is one of ascertaining when and under what conditions do governments recognize and then support educational programs for various ethnic and cultural groups.

This is particularly salient question with respect to the future of bi-lingual education. When is it that educational systems choose to respond. What are the mechanisms that instigate support. Is that "critical mass" essentially numerical or political. Do the policy decisions take into account concerns of effectiveness and efficiency.

(It is qualitatively as well as quantitatively different to instigate a bi-lingual program for 12 as opposed to 2400 students.) Stated somewhat differently, upon what premises do the various member countries respond (or choose not to) to the support of hyphenated identities among those from culturally different groups.

The tension between scope and specificity in targeting programs for different populations represents a fourth important area for further policy analysis. The choices in providing services to youth from special populations range on a continuum from those efforts that are highly targeted towards specific groups to those where there is little or no means testing and programs seek to encompass large numbers of participants. This tension, and one that is especially acute with regard to the needs of special populations, is fundamentally non-resolvable. At best, what each educational system appears to have done is to make decisions on strategies of inclusion/exclusion based on economic, political, and cultural concerns salient to that society.

What has been unexplicated to date, however, are the relative influences of various economic, political, and cultural concerns and how these are juxtaposed in the decision-making process. If all do not carry equal weight, which are of more importance and how is this relative importance translated into policy. Of additional concern is the matter of how it is that these broad forces influence the pedagogical responses of the various educational systems. It is the educational system, after all, that has responsibility for creating programs that in some form reflect the broader contours of the society, including the factors of race, social class, and ethnicity. So long as politics remains the art of deciding who gets what when and at whose expense,

the creation of educational programs for special populations will be a critical arena in which the various forces at work in the member countries will be evident.

The four policy areas detailed above suggest fundamental tensions in the organization, governance, and financing of educational programs for special populations. Yet this ought not to deter further study and analysis, especially as these four are not exhaustive. Rather, it is that in an area of considerable complexity and political sensitivity, cogent and considered attention is of the utmost necessity. To avoid the issues outlined above because of the highly charged reactions to them is to take flight from the realities all five of the nations participating in this present study have begun to face.

What appears particularly important at present is to build upon the contributions of the studies completed to date. Having mapped and charted the broad outlines of how services are organized, financed, and governed for special populations of young persons, it is now possible to move towards a more detailed policy assessment of alternative responses and how it is that present policies have come to be what they are. For it is in this manner that not only may the present be better understood, but also illuminate something of options for the future.